

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS PO Box 1450 Alexandra, Vignus 22313-1450 www.usptc.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILI	ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/933,496	08/20/2001		Norman C. Brackett	71850/55891	5921	
21874	7590	06.05/2003				
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP P.O. BOX 9169				EXAMINER		
BOSTON, M				LE, DANG D		
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				2834		
				DATE MAILED: 06/05/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Supplemental Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/933,496	BRACKETT, NORMAN C.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Dang D Le	2834		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 09 May 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

Examination (RCE) in compilance with 37 CFR 1.114.
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]
 a)
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.NOTE:
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: <u>18-35 and 49-64</u> .
Claim(s) objected to:
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-17 and 39-48</u> .
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)
10. Other: CANGLE 5/3/03 MG DANGLE SEY EXAMINER

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the applicant's argument is not persuasive because claims 1 and 39 still read on Kato.